arXiv:1410.6041v2 [math.AP] 30 Jul 2015

BOUNDEDNESS OF SPECTRAL MULTIPLIERS OF GENERALIZED LAPLACIANS ON COMPACT MANIFOLDS WITH BOUNDARY

MAYUKH MUKHERJEE

Abstract. Consider a second order, strongly elliptic differential operator L (maybe a system) on a compact Riemannian manifold $\overline{M}$ with smooth boundary, where L is defined by coercive boundary conditions. The main result is the $L^\infty - \mathrm{BMO}_L$ continuity of $\varphi(\sqrt{-L})$ for the class of functions $\varphi \in S^0_1(\mathbb{R})$, and then we use it to establish the L^p-continuity of $\varphi(\sqrt{-L})$ for $p \in (1,\infty)$. Finite propagation speed of $\cos t\sqrt{-L}$ is fundamental to our calculations, after the Cheeger-Gromov-Taylor style of analysis ([CGT]). Accordingly we try to derive sufficiency conditions on L to ensure the finite propagation speed of $\cos t\sqrt{-L}$.

1. Introduction

Consider a compact manifold with boundary $\overline{M}$ and a second order, negative semidefinite strongly elliptic differential operator L acting on $L^2(M)$. Let the domain of L be $\mathcal{D}(L) \subset H^2(M)$. Also, assume regular elliptic boundary conditions (for a definition, see Proposition 11.9, Chapter 5 of [T6]) on L which additionally make L into a self-adjoint operator. We want to explicitly point out that unless otherwise mentioned, our analysis will work when L is a system.
Given a bounded continuous function $\psi : \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the spectral theorem defines

$$\psi(\sqrt{-L}) : L^2(M) \longrightarrow L^2(M) \tag{1.1}$$

as a bounded self-adjoint operator. Following [T2] and [T5], here we consider functions φ in the pseudodifferential function class $S^0_1(\mathbb{R})$ To recall what this means,

$$\varphi \in S^0_1(\mathbb{R}) \Longrightarrow |\varphi^{(k)}(\lambda)| \lesssim (1+|\lambda|)^{-k}, k = 0,1,2,... \tag{1.2}$$

Here our main aim is to establish continuity results of the form

$$\varphi(\sqrt{-L}) : L^\infty \longrightarrow \mathrm{BMO}_L \tag{1.3}$$

(for the definition of BMO_L, see Definition 4.1 of Section 4) and also to prove that

$$\varphi(\sqrt{-L}) : L^p \longrightarrow L^p, \ \forall\ p \in (1,\infty) \tag{1.4}$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35L05, 47A60, 58J60.
The author was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1161620.

is bounded. Our main tool will be the following functional calculus, as used in [CGT], namely

$$\varphi(\sqrt{-L}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{\varphi}(t) e^{it\sqrt{-L}} dt. \tag{1.5}$$

We see that $\sqrt{-L}$ is a first order elliptic self-adjoint operator with compact resolvent. So, $\mathrm{Spec}(\sqrt{-L})$ is discrete and real, and since $\sqrt{-L}$ is non-negative, $\mathrm{Spec}(\sqrt{-L}) \subset [0, \infty)$, and it is no loss of generality to assume that $\varphi(\lambda)$ is an even function of λ. This reduces (1.5) to

$$\varphi(\sqrt{-L}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{\varphi}(t) \cos\, t\sqrt{-L}\; dt, \tag{1.6}$$

where $\cos\, t\sqrt{-L}$ is the solution operator to the "wave equation" with zero initial velocity, i.e.,

$$u(t,x) = \cos\, t\sqrt{-L} f(x) \tag{1.7}$$

where

$$\partial_t^2 u - Lu = 0,\ u(0,x) = f(x),\ \partial_t u(0,x) = 0 \tag{1.8}$$

together with the coercive boundary conditions mentioned above.
We split (1.6) into two parts in the following way: let, for $a > 0$ small, $\theta(t)$ be an even function, such that

$$\theta \in C_c^{\infty}((-a,a)), \theta(t) \equiv 1 \text{ on } [-a/2, a/2]. \tag{1.9}$$

Now, denote

$$\hat{\varphi}^{\#}(t) = \theta(t)\hat{\varphi}(t),\ \hat{\varphi}^{b}(t) = (1-\theta(t))\hat{\varphi}(t). \tag{1.10}$$

Then, we can write

$$\varphi(\sqrt{-L}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{\varphi}^{\#}(t) \cos\, t\sqrt{-L} dt + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{\varphi}^{b}(t) \cos\, t\sqrt{-L} dt \tag{1.11}$$

that is

$$\varphi(\sqrt{-L}) = \varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L}) + \varphi^{b}(\sqrt{-L}). \tag{1.12}$$

Also note here that both $\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L})$ and $\varphi^{b}(\sqrt{-L})$ are self-adjoint. Indeed,

$$\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L})^* = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{\varphi}^{\#}(t) (\cos\, t\sqrt{-L})^* dt,$$

and the spectral theorem defines $\cos\, t\sqrt{-L}$ as a bounded self-adjoint operator.
Now, (1.2) implies that φ^b is smooth and rapidly decreasing. So we have

$$|\varphi^b(\lambda)| \lesssim (1+|\lambda|)^{-m}, \text{ for some } m > \frac{n}{2}.$$

Then, the ellipticity of L implies

$$\varphi^b(\sqrt{-L}) : L^2(M) \longrightarrow H^m(M) \subset C(\overline{M}). \tag{1.13}$$

This is because, we can write $\varphi^b(\lambda) = (1+|\lambda|^2)^{-s/2}\psi^b(\lambda)$, $s \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\psi^b(\lambda)$ is a bounded function. That implies

$$\varphi^b(\sqrt{-L}) = (I-L)^{-s/2}\psi^b(\sqrt{-L}).$$

By the spectral theorem, $\psi^b(\sqrt{-L})$ is bounded on L^2, and

$$(I-L)^{-s/2} : L^2(M) \to \mathcal{D}((-L)^{s/2}) \subset H^s(M).$$

We can see that $L^1(M) \subset C(\overline{M})^*$ and the inclusion is continuous. Also, when $m > n/2$, $H^m(M) \subset C(\overline{M})$ by Sobolev embedding. This gives, via duality on (1.13), and self-adjointness of $\varphi^b(\sqrt{-L})$, that

$$\varphi^b(\sqrt{-L}) : L^1(M) \longrightarrow L^2(M) \tag{1.14}$$

is bounded. This, observing the fact that $\overline{M}$ is compact and hence $\|.\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|.\|_{L^q}$ when $p \leq q$, interpolates with (1.1) to give the continuity of

$$\varphi^b(\sqrt{-L}) : L^p(M) \longrightarrow L^p(M) \ \forall\ p \in (1,\infty). \tag{1.15}$$

Note that we are yet to argue the $L^\infty - \mathrm{BMO}_L$ boundedness of $\varphi^b(\sqrt{-L})$; this we will do at the beginning of Section 5 with similar arguments. So, for all continuity related aspects, for the rest of our investigation, we can be concerned with just $\varphi^\#(\sqrt{-L})$. These boundedness considerations will largely be addressed in Sections 4 and 5. For those sections, our standing assumptions will be the following:
Assumption 1: $\cos t\sqrt{-L}$ has finite speed of propagation, which, by scaling L if necessary, we will assume to be ≤ 1.
Assumption 2: L has nice scaling properties, in the following sense:
let L_x denote the operator L in an open ball $U \subset \overline{M}$ in local coordinates x. Now, scale the metric in the ball U by a factor of r. Let the new coordinates be given by $\tilde{x}$ and let $L_{\tilde{x}}$ be the operator L in the new coordinates. Let $\varphi(x)$ be a function in $C_c^\infty(U)$ in the x coordinates and let $\tilde{\varphi}(\tilde{x})$ be the corresponding function in the $\tilde{x}$ coordinates. Then, we must have

$$\tilde{L}\tilde{\varphi} = \frac{1}{r^2}L\varphi. \tag{1.16}$$

1.1. **Main tools.** Let us denote by $p(t,x,y)$ the integral kernel of e^{tL}, so that

$$e^{tL}f(x) = \int_M p(t,x,y)f(y)dy.$$

Henceforth, by straightforward analogy, we will refer to $p(t,x,y)$ as the heat kernel. Amongst our most important tools will be the following estimates in [G]:

Proposition 1.1. *(Greiner) Let $\overline{M}$ be a compact manifold with boundary, and L be a second order self-adjoint nenative semidefinite elliptic system defined by regular elliptic boundary conditions. For some $\kappa \in (0,\infty)$, we have*

$$|p(t,x,y)| \lesssim t^{-n/2}e^{-\kappa d(x,y)^2/t}, t \in (0,1], x,y \in \overline{M}, \tag{1.17}$$

and

$$|\nabla_x p(t,x,y)| \lesssim t^{-n/2-1/2} e^{-\kappa d(x,y)^2/t}, t \in (0,1], x, y \in \overline{M}. \tag{1.18}$$

These we will use to derive estimates on the heat and Poisson semigroups (see Section 2), which will be fundamental to the boundedness estimates we seek to establish. Also, for the purposes of proving said boundedness results, we will not use (1.5) directly, but use a modification of it, following [T5], [T2] and [MMV]. For details on this, see Section 4.

1.2. **A bit of history and motivation.** Let us take the space to review some literature. In the past, arguably the most well-studied case has been for M complete (stronger results for compact) without boundary and $L = \Delta$, the Laplace-Beltrami operator. For typical results on compact manifolds with boundary, we refer to [T1], particularly the combination of Theorem 1.3 of Chapter XII and Theorem 2.5 of Chapter XI. On the non-compact setting, very definitive results abound. For more details, refer to [CGT], [MMV], [T2], [T4], [T5]. In the papers which deal with a non-compact setting, an additional difficulty is in analyzing $\varphi^b(\sqrt{-\Delta})$, because of the failure of the compact Sobolev embedding. Particularly for manifolds like the hyperbolic space, where the volume of a radius r-ball grows exponentially with r, one requires more stringent restrictions on φ, namely, φ being holomorphic on a strip around the x-axis, satisfying bounds of the form (1.2). This condition was first introduced in the paper [CS]. This motivated some research on the optimal width of said strip that allowed the L^p boundedness results to go through on a non-compact setting. To the best of our knowledge, the sharpest results in this direction appear in [T4]. Also, in [CGT], $\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-\Delta})$ was analyzed as a pseudodifferential operator, something we cannot do in our present setting because of the presence of a boundary, as even the square root of the Dirichlet Laplacian does not admit interpretation as a pseudodifferential operator (the scalar square root of the Laplacian fails the "transmission condition"; see, for example, equation (18.2.20) of [Ho]). Our analysis will be a hybrid of the styles of [DOS] and [DM] which use mainly probabilistic arguments at a semigroup level on one hand, and the approach of [T5], which follows and refines the results in [MMV] on the other.

Let us also heuristically discuss some of the main lines of investigation in [DOS] and [DM]. The results are set in the context of an open subset X of a metric measure space of homogeneous type. If L be a negative semi-definite, self-adjoint operator on $L^2(X)$, they assume that the integral kernel of L satisfies

$$|p(t,x,y)| \lesssim t^{-n/m} e^{-\kappa \text{dist } (x,y)^{m/(m-1)}/t^{1/(m-1)}}, \ 0 < t \leq 1, \kappa \in (0,\infty).$$

The motivation behind such assumption is understandable in view of (1.17) and (1.18). Theorem 3.1 of [DOS] establishes L^p-continuity of $\varphi((-L)^{1/m})$ via proving that it is weak type (1, 1). What mainly concerns us with [DOS]

is the fact that they proved L^p continuity of $\varphi((-L)^{1/m})$ via using the following result from [DM]:

Theorem 1.2. *(Duong-McIntosh) Under the hypothesis on L outlined above, let $k_t(x,y)$ denote the integral kernel of $\varphi((-L)^{1/m})(I-e^{tL})$, where $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is bounded and continuous. Also assume*

$$\sup_{t>0}\sup_{y\in X}\int_{X\setminus B_{t^{1/m}}(y)} |k_t(x,y)|dx < \infty. \tag{1.19}$$

Then $\varphi((-L)^{1/m})$ is of weak type (1, 1).

With that in place, our motivation for proving Lemma 4.4 is clear. Note that, in [DOS], (1.19) is only an assumption. To the best of our knowledge, Lemma 4.4 is the first attempt to prove variants of this assumption in explicit situations. It is not too surprising that [DM], working on metric measure spaces, has to assume (1.19), because our proof of Lemma 4.4 here is intrinsically connected to the fact that L is an elliptic differential operator, and the fact that the setting is on a smooth manifold. It seems somewhat unlikely to do away with all the analytic machinery such a setting provides and prove a variant of (1.19) in the general setting of a metric measure space.
We also note here that in the proof of L^p-boundedness of $\varphi(\sqrt{-L})$ in [T2], the main approach is to prove the following

Theorem 1.3. *(Taylor) There exists $C < \infty$, independent of $s \in (0,1]$ and of $y, y' \in \overline{M}$, such that*

$$dist\ (y,y') \leq \frac{s}{2} \implies \|K^{\#}(.,y) - K^{\#}(.,y')\|_{L^1(B_1(y)\setminus B_s(y))} \leq C,$$

where $K^{\#}(x,y)$ is the integral kernel of $\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L})$.

With that in place, as is noted in [T2], the weak type $(1,1)$ property of $\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L})$ is a consequence of Proposition 3.1 of [MMV], which is a variant of Theorem 2.4 in Chapter III of [CW].

1.3. **Outline of the paper.** Here, we take the space to describe the overall outline of the present paper. In Section 2, we establish some useful information about the integral kernels of the operators e^{tL} and $e^{-t\sqrt{-L}}$, which we call, by analogy, heat and Poisson kernels respectively. The properties we are about to establish are quite parallel to their usual Laplacian counterparts, and are essentially required in all the estimates we derive further. In Section 3, we investigate some partial results towards establishing sufficient criteria for $\cos t\sqrt{-L}$ to have finite propagation speed. To wit, we prove that for those operators L which can be written in a specific form (as in 3.1), under Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions (see (3.6 and (3.7) below), and under a technical assumption (see (3.8) below), $\cos t\sqrt{-L}$ has finite speed of propagation. This is the content of Proposition 3.3. In Section 4, we prove that Definition 4.1 of $\mathrm{BMO}_L^{\epsilon}$ is independent of ϵ, as long as

we are on a compact setting. This is the content of Lemma 4.2. Then we proceed to prove our main technical lemma of the paper, Lemma 4.4. We begin Section 5 by arguing the $L^\infty - \mathrm{BMO}_L$ continuity of $\varphi^b(\sqrt{-L})$, and then prove in Proposition 5.1 (using Lemma 4.4) the $L^\infty - \mathrm{BMO}_L$ continuity of $\varphi^\#(\sqrt{-L})$, which finally gives what we want.

2. Some Lemmas: getting familiar with heat and Poisson kernels

In this section, we establish a few properties of the semigroups e^{tL} and $e^{-t\sqrt{-L}}$. Henceforth, we will call them heat and Poisson semigroups respectively in analogy with the corresponding semigroups of the Laplacian.
Since $-L$ is a nonnegative semi-definite self-adjoint operator, by the Hille-Yosida theorem (see [Sc], Proposition 6.14), e^{tL} gives a contraction semigroup on $L^2(M)$.
For later use, we also establish the following

Lemma 2.1.

$$\|e^{tL}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2,Lip)} \lesssim (1 + t^{-n/4-1/2}),\ t > 0. \tag{2.1}$$

Proof. We will first use the gradient estimate (1.18) to prove that

$$\int_M |\nabla_x p(t,x,y)|^2 dy \lesssim t^{-n/2-1}, t \in (0,1]. \tag{2.2}$$

Using (1.18), we see that

$$\int_M |\nabla_x p(t,x,y)|^2 dy \lesssim t^{-n-1} \int_M e^{-2\kappa d(x,y)^2/t} dy. \tag{2.3}$$

Now we consider the identity mapping $i : (\overline{M}, g) \longrightarrow (\overline{M}, \frac{t}{2\kappa} g)$, where $(\overline{M}, \frac{t}{2\kappa} g)$ denotes the manifold $\overline{M}$ with a scaled metric. That gives,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_M e^{-2\kappa d(x,y)^2/t} dy &= \int_M e^{-d(x,z)^2} |Ji| dz \\ &\approx t^{n/2} \int_M e^{-2d(x,z)^2} dz \\ &\approx t^{n/2},\end{aligned}$$

where Ji denotes the Jacobian of the map i and we also use the compactness of $\overline{M}$, which finally gives (2.2).
We have, as usual,

$$e^{tL} f(x) = \int_M p(t,x,y) f(y) dy,$$

implying (by differentiating under the integration sign)

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_x e^{tL} f(x) &= \int_M \nabla_x p(t,x,y) f(y) dy \\ &\leq \|\nabla_x p(t,x,.)\|_{L^2} \|f\|_{L^2},\end{aligned}$$

which gives, by (2.2),

$$\|e^{tL}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2,\mathrm{Lip})} \leq t^{-n/4-1/2}, t \in (0,1]. \tag{2.4}$$

Now, if

$$\mathrm{Spec}(-L) \subset [\rho, \infty), \tag{2.5}$$

then

$$\|e^{tL}f\|_{L^2} \leq e^{-t\rho}\|f\|_{L^2},$$

which, in conjunction with (2.4), means that for $t > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\nabla e^{tL}f(x)| &= |\nabla e^{L/2}e^{L/2}e^{(t-1)L}f(x)| \\
&\lesssim \|e^{L/2}e^{(t-1)L}f\|_{L^2} \text{ from (2.4)} \\
&\leq \|e^{(t-1)L}f\|_{L^2} \text{ (contractivity of heat semigroup)} \\
&\leq e^{-\rho(t-1)}\|f\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

So, putting (2.4) and the last inequality together, we have

$$\|e^{tL}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2,\mathrm{Lip})} \lesssim (1 + t^{-n/4-1/2}),\ t > 0.$$

□

Also, we use the above estimates to derive the following conclusions about the Poisson semigroup.

Lemma 2.2.

$$\|e^{-t\sqrt{-L}}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2,L^\infty)} \lesssim (1 + t^{-n/2}),\ t > 0, \tag{2.6}$$

and

$$\|e^{-t\sqrt{-L}}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2,Lip)} \lesssim (1 + t^{-n/2-1}),\ t > 0. \tag{2.7}$$

Proof. As in Lemma 2.1, starting from (1.17), we can establish that

$$\|e^{tL}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2,L^\infty)} \lesssim (t^{-n/4} + 1),\ t > 0 \tag{2.8}$$

Now, the estimate on $e^{-t\sqrt{-L}}$ can be obtained from the Subordination identity (see (5.22), Chapter 3 of [T6]),

$$e^{-t\sqrt{-L}} \approx \int_0^\infty te^{-t^2/4s}s^{-3/2}e^{sL}ds. \tag{2.9}$$

So,

$$\|e^{-t\sqrt{-L}}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2,L^\infty)} \lesssim \int_0^\infty te^{-t^2/4s}s^{-3/2}\|e^{sL}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2,L^\infty)}ds \tag{2.10}$$

$$\lesssim \int_0^\infty te^{-t^2/4s}s^{-3/2}(s^{-n/4} + 1)ds \tag{2.11}$$

$$\lesssim t\int_0^\infty e^{-t^2/4s}s^{-\frac{6+n}{4}}ds + t\int_0^\infty e^{-t^2/4s}s^{-3/2}ds. \tag{2.12}$$

Calling the first integral above I_1 and the second one I_2, we get

$$I_2 \leq c_0, \tag{2.13}$$

where c_n is a multiple of $\Gamma(\frac{n+1}{2})$ (see [T6] for details, particularly pp 247-248). Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= t\int_0^\infty e^{-t^2/4s} s^{-\frac{3+n/2}{2}} ds \\ &\leq c_{n/2} \frac{t}{(t^2)^{\frac{n+2}{4}}} \\ &\leq c_{n/2} t^{-n/2}. \end{aligned}$$

This gives (2.6).
Now, when $t \in (0,1]$, we can write,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla e^{-t\sqrt{-L}} f\|_{L^\infty} &= \|\nabla e^{tL} e^{-t\sqrt{-L}} e^{-tL} f\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim (t^{-n/4-1/2}) \|e^{-t\sqrt{-L}} e^{-tL} f\|_{L^2} \text{ from (2.4)} \\ &\lesssim (t^{-n/4-1/2}) \|e^{-tL} f\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim (t^{-n/4-1/2}) \|f\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

And when $t \in [1,\infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla e^{-t\sqrt{-L}} f\|_{L^\infty} &= \|\nabla e^{-\sqrt{-L}} e^{-(t-1)\sqrt{-L}} f\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim \|e^{-(t-1)\sqrt{-L}} f\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma. □

3. Finite propagation speed of cos $t\sqrt{-L}$.

In this section we investigate some sufficient criteria for cos $t\sqrt{-L}$ to have finite propagation speed under special boundary conditions.
Here we will establish finite speed of propagation for those L which can be written as

$$-L = D^*D + H \tag{3.1}$$

where D is a first order elliptic differential operator with either the Dirichlet or Neumann boundary condition (see (3.3) and (3.4) below), and $H \in L^2(M)$ is nonnegative. To do this, we invoke the so-called Davies-Gaffney estimates: to recall,

Definition 3.1. *An operator L satisfies the Davies-Gaffney estimates on a manifold M if*

$$(e^{tL}u, v) \leq e^{-\frac{r^2}{4t}} \|u\|_{L^2} \|v\|_{L^2} \tag{3.2}$$

for all $t > 0$, for all pairs of open subsets U, V of M, supp $u \subset U$, supp $v \subset V$, sections $u \in L^2(U), v \in L^2(V)$ and $r = dist\,(U, V)$, the metric distance between U and V.

We also recall the following (see [S], Theorem 2).

Lemma 3.2. *For a self-adjoint negative semi-definite operator L on $L^2(M)$, satisfaction of the Davies-Gaffney estimates is equivalent to finite propagation speed property of $\cos t\sqrt{-L}$. Furthermore, it is enough to check the Davies-Gaffney estimates only for open sets U, V which are balls around some points.*

It might be pointed out that this method is eminently suited to establishing finite propagation speed type results particularly when the manifold has boundary or is less "nice" in some other way, as the theorem above holds in the great generality of metric measure spaces (X, d, μ), where μ is a Borel measure with respect to the topology defined by d.
So, to establish the finite propagation speed of $\cos t\sqrt{-L}$ in our current setting, we attempt to establish the Davies-Gaffney estimates. Let $-L = D^*D + H$, where $D : H^1(\overline{M}, E) \to H^2(\overline{M}, F)$ be a first-order differential operator between sections of vector bundles. Assume that the symbol $\sigma_D(x, \xi) : E_x \to F_x$ is injective for $x \in \overline{M}, \xi \in T^*_x\overline{M} \setminus \{0\}$. Following [T6], consider the following generalization of the Dirichlet condition on $\mathcal{D}(D)$:

$$u \in \mathcal{D}(D) \Rightarrow \beta(x)u(x) = 0,\ \forall x \in \partial M, \tag{3.3}$$

where $\beta(x)$ is an orthogonal projection on E_x for all $x \in \partial M$.
We also consider the following generalization of the Neumann boundary condition:

$$u \in \mathcal{D}(D) \Rightarrow \gamma(x)\sigma_D(x, \nu)u(x) = 0,\ \forall x \in \partial M, \tag{3.4}$$

where $\nu(x)$ is the outward unit normal to ∂M and $\gamma(x)$ is an orthogonal projection on E_x for all $x \in \partial M$.
We first argue that both these boundary conditions have the consequence that

$$\langle \sigma_D(x, \nu)v, w\rangle = 0,\ \forall x \in \partial M, \tag{3.5}$$

when $v \in \mathcal{D}(D), w \in \mathcal{D}^*(D)$ and v, w are smooth.
Why is that? We know

$$\int_M (\langle Dv, w\rangle - \langle v, D^*w\rangle)dV = \frac{1}{i}\int_{\partial M} \langle \sigma_D(x, \nu)v, w\rangle dS.$$

Now, $w \in \mathcal{D}(D^*)$ implies that the left hand side in the above equation vanishes. So, for the Dirichlet boundary condition, for smooth v, w we have

$$w \in \mathcal{D}(D^*) \Longrightarrow (I - \beta(x))\sigma_D(x, \nu)^* w(x) = 0, x \in \partial M, \tag{3.6}$$

where ν is the outward unit normal to ∂M. This gives, for smooth v and w,

$$v \in \mathcal{D}(D), w \in \mathcal{D}(D^*) \Longrightarrow \langle \sigma_D(x, \nu)v, w\rangle = 0 \text{ on } \partial M.$$

For the Neumann boundary condition, (3.6) will be replaced by

$$w \in \mathcal{D}(D^*) \Longrightarrow (I - \gamma(x))w(x) = 0, x \in \partial M \tag{3.7}$$

with the same conclusion (3.5).
With that in place, we have,

Proposition 3.3. *Let $-L = D^*D + H$ with the generalized Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions on D, as defined in (3.3) and (3.4), and with $H \geq 0$ in $L^2(M)$. Let U, V be two open balls such that dist$(U, V) = r$. With $t > 0$ fixed, let $\varphi(x) = \frac{r}{t}$dist (x, U) and $P = [D, e^{\varphi}]$ denote a commutator operator. Then cos $t\sqrt{-L}$ has finite speed of propagation if it satisfies for all $v \in L^2$ the following:*

$$\|e^{-\varphi/2} P v\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{r}{t} \|e^{\varphi/2} v\|_{L^2} \tag{3.8}$$

Proof. We first observe that by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$(e^{tL}u, v) \leq \|\chi_V e^{tL} u\|_{L^2} \|v\|_{L^2}, \tag{3.9}$$

where χ_V represents the characteristic function of V.
So, to get finite speed of propagation, we want to establish the Davies-Gaffney estimates

$$(e^{tL}u, v) \leq e^{-\frac{r^2}{4t}} \|u\|_{L^2} \|v\|_{L^2}, \tag{3.10}$$

which will in turn be implied by

$$\|\chi_V e^{tL} u\|_{L^2} \leq e^{-\frac{r^2}{4t}} \|u\|_{L^2}, \tag{3.11}$$

when supp $u \subset U$. Now, let $w = \chi_V e^{tL} u$ and call $\rho = \frac{r}{t}$. Then we have

$$\int_V |w|^2 dx \leq e^{-\rho r} \int_V \langle w, w \rangle e^{\varphi(x)} dx \tag{3.12}$$

$$\leq e^{-\rho r} \int_M \langle e^{tL}u, e^{tL}u \rangle e^{\varphi(x)} dx. \tag{3.13}$$

Let us define

$$E(t) = \int_M \langle e^{tL}u, e^{tL}u \rangle e^{\varphi(x)} dx. \tag{3.14}$$

Differentiating (3.14) with respect to t, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}E'(t) &= \mathrm{Re}\int_M \langle \partial_t e^{tL}u, e^{tL}u\rangle e^{\varphi(x)}dx \\
&= \mathrm{Re}\int_M \langle Le^{tL}u, e^{tL}u\rangle e^{\varphi(x)}dx \\
&= -\mathrm{Re}\int_M \langle (D^*D+H)e^{tL}u, e^{tL}u\rangle e^{\varphi(x)}dx \\
&= -\mathrm{Re}\int_M \langle De^{tL}u, D(e^{tL}ue^{\varphi(x)})\rangle dx - \mathrm{Re}\int_M H\langle e^{tL}u, e^{tL}u\rangle e^{\varphi(x)}dx \\
&+ \mathrm{Re}\frac{1}{i}\int_{\partial M}\langle \sigma(x,\nu)e^{tL}ue^{\varphi(x)}, De^{tL}u\rangle dS \\
&= -\mathrm{Re}\int_M (\langle De^{tL}u, De^{tL}u\rangle e^{\varphi(x)} + \langle De^{tL}u, [D, e^{\varphi(x)}]e^{tL}u\rangle)dx \\
&- \mathrm{Re}\int_M H\langle e^{tL}u, e^{tL}u\rangle e^{\varphi(x)}dx + \ \mathrm{Re}\frac{1}{i}\int_{\partial M}\langle \sigma(x,\nu)e^{tL}ue^{\varphi(x)}, De^{tL}u\rangle dS \\
&\leq -\mathrm{Re}\int_M (\langle De^{tL}u, De^{tL}u\rangle e^{\varphi(x)} + \langle De^{tL}u, [D, e^{\varphi(x)}]e^{tL}u\rangle)dx,
\end{aligned}$$

using the facts that $H \geq 0$ and that under the Dirichlet or the Neumann boundary condition, the last term $\int_{\partial M}\langle \sigma_D(x,\nu)e^{tL}ue^{\varphi(x)}, Du\rangle dS$ disappears.
Now, if we can say that the quantity $\frac{1}{2}E'(t)$ is

$$\leq \frac{\rho^2}{4}\int_M \langle e^{tL}u, e^{tL}u\rangle, e^{\varphi(x)}dx$$

then we will be in a position to use Gronwall's inequality.
Now what is the condition that allows this? Let us define $P = [D, e^{\varphi}]$. Now we have

$$\begin{aligned}
4(De^{tL}u, Pe^{tL}u) &= 4(e^{\varphi/2}De^{tL}u, e^{-\varphi/2}Pe^{tL}u) \\
&\leq 4\|e^{\varphi/2}De^{tL}u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|e^{-\varphi/2}Pe^{tL}u\|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

So it seems that the correct condition is to demand that

$$\|e^{-\varphi/2}Pe^{tL}u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \rho^2\|e^{\varphi/2}e^{tL}u\|_{L^2}^2$$

or,

$$\|e^{-\varphi/2}Pv\|_{L^2} \leq \rho\|e^{\varphi/2}v\|_{L^2}. \tag{3.15}$$

Heuristically, we can say that a condition like this is expected, as the propagation phenomenon of $\cos t\sqrt{-L}$ will be dictated by the interaction of L, and hence of D with the distance function on $\overline{M}$.
So, now we can say

$$E'(t) \leq \rho^2/2E(t). \tag{3.16}$$

This gives, by Gronwall's inequality, $E(t) \leq e^{\rho^2 t/2} E(0)$.
Plugging everything back, we have from (3.12),

$$\int_V |w|^2 dx \leq e^{\rho^2 t/2 - \rho r} \|u\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Using $\rho = r/t$, we have

$$\int_V |w|^2 dx \leq e^{-\frac{r^2}{2t}} \|u\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{3.17}$$

This proves what we want. □

Remark 3.4. *Though (3.8) does not seem to be much of an improvement over (3.10), in certain situations (3.8) is easier to verify than (3.10). For example, if L is the Laplace Beltrami operator with Dirichlet or Neumann boundary condition, then (3.8) holds trivially, because $|\nabla \varphi(x)| \leq \frac{r}{t}$ (as the gradient of the distance function to any set is known as a 1-Lipschitz function), which gives us back the special case of finite propagation speed of cos $t\sqrt{-\Delta}$. Verifying (3.10) seems to be harder in this case.*

Now, we extend the range of H in Proposition 3.3 to $H \in L^2(M)$. Towards that end, pick H_n continuous such that $H_n \longrightarrow H$ and consider $\mathcal{L}_n$ given by $-\mathcal{L}_n = D^*D + H_n$. Let $-\mathcal{L} = D^*D + H$.
We can see that $\mathcal{L}_n(u) \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}(u)$ for $u \in \mathcal{D}(D^*D)$ as $n \longrightarrow \infty$. That means, $\mathcal{L}_n \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}$ in the strong resolvent sense as $n \longrightarrow \infty$ (see [RS], Chapter VIII). Then, cos tx and e^{-tx} being bounded continuous functions on $\mathbb{R}$ for all $t > 0$, we have $\forall u \in \mathcal{D}(D)$,

$$\cos t\sqrt{-\mathcal{L}_n} u \longrightarrow \cos t\sqrt{-\mathcal{L}} u,$$
$$e^{t\mathcal{L}_n} u \longrightarrow e^{t\mathcal{L}} u.$$

The finite propagation speed of cos $t\sqrt{-\mathcal{L}}$ now follows by the Davies-Gaffney estimates: if for a fixed pair $U, V \subset \overline{M}$ of open sets, L^2 sections u, v such that supp $u \subset U$, supp $v \subset V$, $r = \text{dist}\,(U, V)$, we have

$$(e^{t\mathcal{L}_n} u, v) \leq e^{-\frac{r^2}{4t}} \|u\|_{L^2} \|v\|_{L^2}, \tag{3.18}$$

then in the limit, we must have

$$(e^{t\mathcal{L}} u, v) \leq e^{-\frac{r^2}{4t}} \|u\|_{L^2} \|v\|_{L^2}. \tag{3.19}$$

4. $L^\infty - \mathbf{BMO}_L$ continuity and L^p-continuity

In this section we investigate the continuity property of $\varphi(\sqrt{-L})$ from L^∞ to BMO_L-spaces, under the standing assumptions of finite speed of propagation of cos $t\sqrt{-L}$ and the scaling property of L mentioned in the introduction. We combine the definition of BMO_L in [DY] with the definition of local BMO spaces in [T3] to give the following

Definition 4.1. *$f \in L^1_{loc}(M)$ is in $BMO^\epsilon_L(M)$ if*

$$\fint_B |f(x) - e^{tL} f(x)|dx \leq C, \tag{4.1}$$

where $\sqrt{t}$ is the radius of the ball B, and B ranges over all balls in the manifold of radius $\leq \epsilon$.

We now make the observation that our definition of BMO^ϵ_L is actually independent of the ϵ chosen.

Lemma 4.2.

$$\|f\|_{BMO_L^{\sqrt{2R}}} \cong \|f\|_{BMO_L^{\sqrt{R}}} \tag{4.2}$$

where $R > 0$.

Proof. Clearly,

$$\|f\|_{\mathrm{BMO}_L^{\sqrt{2R}}} \geq \|f\|_{\mathrm{BMO}_L^{\sqrt{R}}}.$$

For the reverse inequality, let us fix a point $y \in \overline{M}$. Then we have, for $r \leq R$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{2r}}(y)|}\int_{B_{\sqrt{2r}}(y)} |f(x) - e^{2rL}f(x)|dx - \frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{r}}(y)|}\int_{B_{\sqrt{r}}(y)} |f(x) - e^{rL}f(x)|dx \\
\lesssim\ &\frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{r}}(y)|}\int_{B_{\sqrt{2r}}(y)} |f(x) - e^{2rL}f(x) - \chi_{B_{\sqrt{r}}(y)}(x)f(x) + \chi_{B_{\sqrt{r}}(y)}(x)e^{rL}f(x)|dx \\
\lesssim\ &\frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{r}}(y)|}\int_{B_{\sqrt{2r}}(y)} |\chi_A(x)f(x) - e^{2rL}f(x) + \chi_{B_{\sqrt{r}}(y)}(x)e^{rL}f(x)|dx,
\end{aligned}$$

where A denotes the "annulus" $B_{\sqrt{2r}}(y) \setminus B_{\sqrt{r}}(y)$, which can be covered by at most K balls of radius $\sqrt{r}$, where K is a positive number independent of r, because $\overline{M}$ is compact. Also, in the ensuing calculation, we tacitly use the fact that the volume of a ball of radius r is uniformly bounded.
Now, the last quantity in the above equation is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{r}}(y)|}\int_{B_{\sqrt{2r}}(y)} |\chi_A(x)f(x) - \chi_A(x)e^{2rL}f(x)|dx \\
&+\frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{r}}(y)|}\int_{B_{\sqrt{2r}}(y)} |\chi_{B_{\sqrt{r}}(y)}(x)e^{2rL}f(x) - \chi_{B_{\sqrt{r}}(y)}(x)e^{rL}f(x)|dx \\
&\leq \frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{r}}(y)|}\int_{B_{\sqrt{2r}}(y)} |\chi_A(x)f(x) - \chi_A(x)e^{rL}f(x)|dx \\
&+\frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{r}}(y)|}\int_{B_{\sqrt{2r}}(y)} |\chi_A(x)e^{2rL}f(x) - \chi_A(x)e^{rL}f(x)|dx \\
&+\frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{r}}(y)|}\int_{B_{\sqrt{2r}}(y)} |\chi_{B_{\sqrt{r}}(y)}(x)e^{2rL}f(x) - \chi_{B_{\sqrt{r}}(y)}(x)e^{rL}f(x)|dx \\
&= \frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{r}}(y)|}\int_A |f(x) - e^{rL}f(x)|dx + \frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{r}}(y)|}\int_A |e^{2rL}f(x) - e^{rL}f(x)|dx
\end{aligned}$$

$$+\frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{r}}(y)|}\int_{B_{\sqrt{r}}(y)}|e^{2rL}f(x)-e^{rL}f(x)|dx=A+B+C \text{ (say) }.$$

Putting everything together, we have that

(4.3)
$$\frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{2r}}(y)|}\int_{B_{\sqrt{2r}}(y)}|f(x)-e^{2rL}f(x)|dx-\frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{r}}(y)|}\int_{B_{\sqrt{r}}(y)}|f(x)-e^{rL}f(x)|dx \lesssim A+B+C.$$

Now, if we let $e^{rL}f(x)=g(x)$, and can prove that

$$\|g\|_{\mathrm{BMO}_L^{\sqrt{r}}}\lesssim\|f\|_{\mathrm{BMO}_L^{\sqrt{r}}}, \tag{4.4}$$

then we have that each of A,B,C is $\lesssim\|f\|_{\mathrm{BMO}_L^{\sqrt{R}}}$, giving us our result from (4.3).
Now we justify (4.4). Choose $\varepsilon>0$ and let $\mathcal{B}$ consist of all balls in M whose radii are $\leq\varepsilon$. Choose $s>0$ such that $\sqrt{s}\leq\varepsilon$. As per the notation above, if $u(x)=e^{sL}f(x)-f(x)$, observe that it suffices to prove that

$$\sup_{B_{\sqrt{s}}\in\mathcal{B}}\frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{s}}|}\int_{B_{\sqrt{s}}}|e^{sL}u(x)|dx\lesssim\sup_{B_{\sqrt{s}}\in\mathcal{B}}\frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{s}}|}\int_{B_{\sqrt{s}}}|u(x)|dx.$$

Now, we have,

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{B_{\sqrt{s}}\in\mathcal{B}}\frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{s}}|}\int_{B_{\sqrt{s}}}|e^{sL}u(x)|dx&\lesssim\sup_{B_{\sqrt{s}}\in\mathcal{B}}\frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{s}}|}\int_{B_{\sqrt{s}}}\int_M|p(s,z,x)u(z)|dzdx\\&\lesssim\sup_{B_{\sqrt{s}}\in\mathcal{B}}\frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{s}}|}s^{-n/2}\int_{B_{\sqrt{s}}}\|u\|_{L^1(M)}\text{ (from (1.17))}\\&=s^{-n/2}\|u\|_{L^1(M)}.\end{aligned}$$

So we are done if we can prove that

$$\|u\|_{L^1(M)}\lesssim\sup_{B_{\sqrt{s}}\in\mathcal{B}}\frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{s}}|}\|u\|_{L^1(B_{\sqrt{s}})}.$$

This will be proved if we can prove that

$$\frac{1}{|M|}\|u\|_{L^1(M)}\leq\sup_{B_{\sqrt{s}}\in\mathcal{B}}\frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{s}}|}\|u\|_{L^1(B_{\sqrt{s}})}, \tag{4.5}$$

which is certainly true. To derive a rigorous demonstration of (4.5), one can consider a partition of $\overline{M}$ into balls coming from $\mathcal{B}$. Let $\overline{M}=\coprod_n B_n$, where

$B_n \in \mathcal{B}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{|M|}\|u\|_{L^1(M)} &= \frac{1}{|M|}\sum_n \|u\|_{L^1(B_n)} = \frac{1}{|M|}\sum_n |B_n|\frac{1}{|B_n|}\|u\|_{L^1(B_n)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|M|}\sum_n |B_n| \sup_{B\in\mathcal{B}}\frac{1}{|B|}\|u\|_{L^1(B)} \\ &= \sup_{B\in\mathcal{B}}\frac{1}{|B|}\|u\|_{L^1(B)}.\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof. □

At this point, let us recall the main approach of [T5], [T2] and [MMV]. The analyses in these papers avoided producing a parametrix for (1.6). Instead, they replaced (1.6) by the following

$$\varphi(\sqrt{-L}) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi_k(t)\mathcal{J}_{k-1/2}(t\sqrt{-L})\ dt, \tag{4.6}$$

where

$$\mathcal{J}_\nu(\lambda) = \lambda^{-\nu}J_\nu(\lambda),$$

$J_\nu(\lambda)$ denoting the standard Bessel function (see [T5], equation (3.1) and [T6], Chapter 3, Section 6 for more details on Bessel functions), and

$$\varphi_k(t) = \prod_{j=1}^{k}(-t\frac{d}{dt} + 2j - 2)\hat{\varphi}(t).$$

[T5] derives (4.6) from (1.6) by an integration by parts argument (see (3.7) - (3.9) of [T5]).
Similarly, from [T5], (3.14), we have

$$\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L}) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_k(t)\mathcal{J}_{k-1/2}(t\sqrt{-L})\ dt \tag{4.7}$$

with

$$\psi_k(t) = \prod_{j=1}^{k}(-t\frac{d}{dt} + 2j - 2)\hat{\varphi}^{\#}(t), \tag{4.8}$$

where,

$$\text{supp } \psi_k \subset [-a, a]. \tag{4.9}$$

Also, (1.2) implies

$$|(t\partial_t)^j\hat{\varphi}(t)| \leq C_j|t|^{-1},\ \forall j \in \{0, 1, ..., [\frac{n}{2}] + 2\},$$

which in turn implies

$$|\psi_k(t)| \leq C_k|t|^{-1},\ 0 \leq k \leq [\frac{n}{2}] + 2. \tag{4.10}$$

Now, let $k^{\#}(x,y)$ denote the integral kernel of $\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L})$, that is,

$$\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L})f(x) = \int_M k^{\#}(x,y)f(y)dy. \tag{4.11}$$

Without any loss of generality, we can scale L so that the speed of propagation of $\cos t\sqrt{-L}$ is ≤ 1, which has been stated as Assumption 1. Also, let us select $a = 1$ in (4.9), (1.9) and (1.10).
Now we address one fundamental question: why this choice of a and why is the finite propagation speed of $\cos t\sqrt{-L}$ so important? This has to do with the support of the integral kernel $k^{\#}(x,y)$. If the speed of propagation of $\cos t\sqrt{-L}$ is ≤ 1, then $k^{\#}(x,y)$ is supported within a distance ≤ 1 from the diagonal. Let us justify this: we have

$$\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L})f(x) = \int_M k^{\#}(x,y)f(y)dy = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{\varphi}^{\#}(t)\cos\, t\sqrt{-L}f(x)dt.$$

Suppose the propagation speed of $\cos t\sqrt{-L}$ is ≤ 1. Then, when $|t| \leq 1$,

$$\text{supp}\, \cos\, t\sqrt{-L}f(x) \subset \{x \in \overline{M} : \text{dist}\, (x, \text{supp}\, f) \leq t\}.$$

When $|t| > 1$, $\hat{\varphi}^{\#}(t) = 0$. So, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L})f(x)$ will be zero for all $x \in \overline{M}$ such that $\text{dist}(x, \text{supp}\, f) > 1$. Since this happens for all $f \in L^2(M)$, we have that $k^{\#}(x,y)$ is supported within a distance of 1 from the diagonal. This property will be crucially used in the sequel.
Using (4.7), (4.9) and the fact that ψ_k is an even function, we can write

$$k^{\#}(x,z) = \int_0^1 \psi_k(s)B_k(s,x,z)ds \tag{4.12}$$

where $B_k(t,x,y)$ is the integral kernel of $\mathcal{J}_{k-1/2}(t\sqrt{-L})$, that is,

$$\mathcal{J}_{k-1/2}(t\sqrt{-L})f(x) = \int_M B_k(t,x,y)f(y)dy.$$

Let us also record the following formula:

$$\mathcal{J}_{k-1/2}(t\sqrt{-L}) \approx \int_{-1}^{1} (1-s^2)^{k-1}\cos\, st\sqrt{-L}ds. \tag{4.13}$$

We have assumed that the speed of propagation of $\cos t\sqrt{-L}$ is ≤ 1. Observe that, written in symbols, this means,

$$\text{supp}\, f \subset K \Rightarrow \text{supp}\, \cos\, t\sqrt{-L}f \subset K_{|t|},$$

where $K_{|t|} = \{x \in \overline{M} : \text{dist}(x,K) \leq |t|\}$. This gives, in conjunction with (4.13),

$$\text{supp}\, f \subset K \Rightarrow \text{supp}\, \mathcal{J}_{k-1/2}(t\sqrt{-L})f \subset K_{|t|}. \tag{4.14}$$

We now derive a technical estimate on $\|B_k(s,x,.)\|_{L^2(B_1(x))}$ which we will find essential in the sequel. These estimates are variants of Lemma 2.2 in [T2].

Lemma 4.3.

$$\|B_k(s,x,.)\|_{L^2(B_1(x))} \lesssim s^{-n/2},\ s \in (0,1], x \in \overline{M}. \tag{4.15}$$

Proof. We will first prove that if $G : \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies

$$|G(\lambda)| \lesssim (1+|\lambda|)^{-\gamma-1}, \gamma > n/2, \tag{4.16}$$

then

$$\|G(s\sqrt{-L})\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2,L^\infty)} \lesssim s^{-n/2}, s \in (0,1]. \tag{4.17}$$

Now, we use the following estimate:

$$|\mathcal{J}_{k-1/2}(\lambda)| \lesssim (1+|\lambda|)^{-k}, k > 0.$$

We write

$$G(s\sqrt{-L}) = (I-s^2L)^{-\sigma} G(s\sqrt{-L})(I-s^2L)^{\sigma}, 2\sigma = \gamma + 1. \tag{4.18}$$

Now, let $F(\lambda) = G(\lambda)(1-\lambda^2)^\sigma$. Then, using $\gamma > n/2$ and $2\sigma = \gamma + 1$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} |F(\lambda)| = |G(\lambda)(1-\lambda^2)^\sigma| &\lesssim (1+|\lambda|)^{-\gamma-1}|1-\lambda^2|^\sigma \\ &\lesssim (1+|\lambda|)^{2\sigma-\gamma-1} \leq C. \end{aligned}$$

Since F is bounded, by the spectral theorem, $F(s\sqrt{-L}) : L^2 \longrightarrow L^2$ is continuous. So by virtue of (4.18), our task is reduced to proving that

$$\|(I-s^2L)^{-\sigma}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2,L^\infty)} \lesssim s^{-n/2}, \sigma > n/4. \tag{4.19}$$

Now, we use the following identity from that can be derived from the definition of the gamma function:

$$(I-s^2L)^{-\sigma} \approx \int_0^\infty e^{-r} e^{rs^2L} r^{\sigma-1} dr,$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|(I-s^2L)^{-\sigma}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2,L^\infty)} &\lesssim \int_0^{s^{-2}} e^{-r}\|e^{rs^2L}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2,L^\infty)} r^{\sigma-1} dr + \int_{s^{-2}}^\infty e^{-r}\|e^{rs^2L}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2,L^\infty)} r^{\sigma-1} dr \\ &\lesssim \int_0^{s^{-2}} e^{-r}(rs^2)^{-n/4} r^{\sigma-1} dr + \int_{s^{-2}}^\infty e^{-r} r^{\sigma-1} dr \\ &\lesssim (s^{-n/2}+1) \lesssim s^{-n/2},\ s \in (0,1], \end{aligned}$$

where in going from the second to the third step, we have used that

$$\|e^{tL}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2,L^\infty)} \lesssim t^{-n/4},\ t \in (0,1]$$

and

$$\|e^{tL}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2,L^\infty)} \lesssim 1,\ t > 1.$$

This establishes (4.17). That is,

$$|G(s\sqrt{-L})f(x)| \lesssim s^{-n/2}\|f\|_{L^2},\ s \in (0,1].$$

In particular, with $f = \delta_x$ and using the compactness of $\overline{M}$, we have

$$\|g(s,x,.)\|_{L^2} \lesssim s^{-n/2},\ s \in (0,1].$$

□

Finally, denote by $k_t(x,y)$ the integral kernel of the composite operator $\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L})e^{tL}$.
We are in a position to state the main technical lemma of this paper:

Lemma 4.4. *(***Key Lemma***) We have for some $\varepsilon > 0$*

$$\sup_{t\in(0,\varepsilon]}\sup_{y\in M}\int_{M\setminus B_{\sqrt{t}}(y)} |k^{\#}(x,y) - k_t(x,y)|dx < \infty. \tag{4.20}$$

Proof. We have

$$\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L})e^{tL}f(x) = \int_M k_t(x,y)f(y)dy. \tag{4.21}$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L})e^{tL}f(x) &= \int_M k^{\#}(x,y)e^{tL}f(y)dy\\ &= \int_M k^{\#}(x,y)\int_M p(t,y,z)f(z)dzdy\\ &= \int_M\int_M k^{\#}(x,y)p(t,y,z)f(z)dzdy.\end{aligned}$$

Interchanging the variables y and z, we get

$$\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L})e^{tL}f(x) = \int_M\int_M k^{\#}(x,z)p(t,z,y)f(y)dydz. \tag{4.22}$$

Comparing (4.21) and (4.22), we get

$$k_t(x,y) = \int_M k^{\#}(x,z)p(t,z,y)dz = e^{tL_y}k^{\#}(x,y).$$

Interchanging x and y and using the symmetry of the integral kernels, we get

$$k_t(x,y) = k_t(y,x) = e^{tL_x}k^{\#}(y,x) = e^{tL_x}k^{\#}(x,y).$$

Henceforth, we shall drop the subscript x in L_x and L will refer to a differential operator in the x-variable, unless otherwise mentioned explicitly.
To show (4.20), all we want is a uniform bound on

$$\|e^{tL}k^{\#}(.,y) - k^{\#}(.,y)\|_{L^1(M\setminus B_{\sqrt{t}}(y))}. \tag{4.23}$$

To derive (4.23), it is clear (by the Mean value theorem) that a uniform bound on

$$\|e^{t'L}tLk^{\#}(.,y)\|_{L^1(M\setminus B_{\sqrt{t}}(y))},$$

where $t' \in (0,t]$, will suffice. Now, since $k^{\#}(x,y)$ is a fixed kernel, we can choose t small enough such that

$$\|e^{t'L}tLk^{\#}(.,y)\|_{L^1(M\setminus B_{\sqrt{t}}(y))} \leq C\|tLk^{\#}(.,y)\|_{L^1(M\setminus B_{\sqrt{t}}(y))},$$

where C does not depend on t. This latter quantity, using the relation between $k^{\#}(x,y)$ and $B_k(s,x,y)$ given by (4.12), is equal to

$$\|tL\int_0^1 \psi_k(s)B_k(s,.,y)ds\|_{L^1(M\setminus B_{\sqrt{t}}(y))}. \tag{4.24}$$

Now, when $s' \leq \sqrt{t}$, we have by (4.14) that $\int_0^{s'} \psi_k(s)B(s,x,y)ds$ is supported on $\{(x,y) \in \overline{M}\times\overline{M} : \mathrm{dist}(x,y) \leq s'\}$. So, (4.24) gives via (4.10) that,

$$\|tL\int_0^1 \psi_k(s)B_k(s,.,y)ds\|_{L^1(M\setminus B_{\sqrt{t}}(y))} \lesssim t\int_{\sqrt{t}}^1 \frac{1}{s}\|LB_k(s,.,y)\|_{L^1(M\setminus B_{\sqrt{t}}(y))}ds,$$

which we must prove to be uniformly bounded. If we can prove

$$\|LB_k(s,.,y)\|_{L^1(M\setminus B_{\sqrt{t}}(y))} \lesssim s^{-2},$$

then we are done. Observe that this will be implied by

$$\|LB_k(s,.,y)\|_{L^2(M\setminus B_{\sqrt{t}}(y))} \lesssim s^{-n/2-2}. \tag{4.25}$$

This is because, from (4.14), we see that $B_k(s,.,y)$ is supported on the ball $B_s(y) \subset \overline{M}$, so

$$\begin{aligned}\|LB_k(s,.,y)\|_{L^1(M\setminus B_{\sqrt{t}}(y))} &\lesssim |B_s(y)|^{1/2}\|LB_k(s,.,y)\|_{L^2(M\setminus B_{\sqrt{t}}(y))}\\ &\lesssim |B_s(y)|^{1/2}s^{-n/2-2} \lesssim s^{-2}.\end{aligned}$$

So, we are done if we can prove that,

$$\|LB_k(s,.,y)\|_{L^2} \lesssim s^{-n/2-2}. \tag{4.26}$$

We observe that (4.26) is a variant of Lemma 2.2 of [T2] and proceeds along absolutely similar lines. See the lemmas below, which finish the proof.

□

Lemma 4.5.

$$\|Le^{-s\sqrt{-L}}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2,L^\infty)} \lesssim s^{-n/2-2}, s \in (0,1]. \tag{4.27}$$

Proof. For $f \in L^2(M)$, call

$$u_s(x) = e^{-s\sqrt{-L}}f(x), s > 0, x \in \overline{M}. \tag{4.28}$$

Then u is a solution of

$$(\partial_s^2 + L)u = 0, \text{ on } (0,\infty)\times M \tag{4.29}$$

$$B(x,\partial_x)u = 0, \text{ on } (0,\infty)\times \partial M, \tag{4.30}$$

where B represents the coercive boundary condition defining $\mathcal{D}(L)$. We have, by the Hille Yosida theorem,

$$\|u_s\|_{L^2(M)} = \|e^{-s\sqrt{-L}}f\|_{L^2} \leq \|f\|_{L^2(M)}, \forall s > 0.$$

Let us pick $\delta \in (0,1], s_0 = \delta$, and $x_0 \in \overline{M}$. Let $U = \{x \in \overline{M} : \text{dist}(x, x_0) < 2\delta\}$. We now scale the s and the x variables by a factor of $1/\delta$, and let $v_s(x)$ denote the new function corresponding to u_s in the scaled variables. Then v solves

$$(\partial_s^2 + \tilde{L})v = 0, \text{ on } (1/2, 3/2) \times \tilde{U}, \tag{4.31}$$

$$\tilde{B}(x, \partial_x)v = 0, \text{ on } (1/2, 3/2) \times (\tilde{U} \cap \partial M), \tag{4.32}$$

which is a coercive boundary valued elliptic system with uniformly smooth coefficients and uniform ellipticity bounds. On calculation,

$$\|v\|_{L^2((1/2,3/2)\times\tilde{U})} \approx \delta^{-n/2}\|u\|_{L^2((\delta/2,3\delta/2)\times U)} \lesssim \delta^{-n/2}\|f\|_{L^2}.$$

From Schauder estimates we get $C^{2,\alpha}$ bounds on v which imply, in particular, that

$$\|Lv_1(.)\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{U_0})} \lesssim \|v\|_{L^2((1/2,3/2)\times\tilde{U})} \lesssim \delta^{-n/2}\|f\|_{L^2}, \tag{4.33}$$

and scaling back gives our result (here we finally get to use our assumption (1.16)),

$$|Lu_{s_0}(x_0)| \lesssim \delta^{-n/2-2}\|f\|_{L^2}.$$

□

Lemma 4.6. *If $G : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies*

$$|G(\lambda)| \lesssim (1 + |\lambda|)^{-\gamma-1}, \gamma > \frac{n}{2},$$

then

$$\|LG(s\sqrt{-L})\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2,L^\infty)} \lesssim s^{-n/2-2}, s \in (0,1]. \tag{4.34}$$

This implies (4.26).

Proof. We start by using the formula

$$(I + s\sqrt{-L})^{-\sigma} = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\sigma)}\int_0^\infty e^{-t}e^{-ts\sqrt{-L}}t^{\sigma-1}dt.$$

That implies, in conjunction with (4.27),

$$\begin{aligned}\|L(I + s\sqrt{-L})^{-\sigma}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2,L^\infty)} &\lesssim \int_0^{1/s} e^{-t}(st)^{-n/2-2}t^{\sigma-1}dt \\ &\quad + \int_{1/s}^\infty e^{-t}\|Le^{-ts\sqrt{-L}}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2,L^\infty)}t^{\sigma-1}dt \\ &\lesssim s^{-n/2-2} + 1, \end{aligned} \tag{4.35}$$

where $\sigma > n/2 + 2$.
Also, in the above calculation, we have used that when $r \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|Le^{-r\sqrt{-L}}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2,L^\infty)} &= \|Le^{-\sqrt{-L}}e^{-(r-1)\sqrt{-L}}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2,L^\infty)} \\ &\lesssim \|e^{-(r-1)\sqrt{-L}}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2,L^2)} \\ &\leq 1.\end{aligned}$$

The facts that (4.35) implies (4.34) and (4.34) implies (4.26) are absolutely similar to the proof of Lemma 4.3. □

5. $L^\infty - \mathrm{BMO}_L$ CONTINUITY

Before we start the section proper, let us make a notational convention: for the rest of this section, by $T : X \to Y$, we will mean T is a continuous operator between function spaces X and Y.
Now, to establish L^∞-BMO_L continuity, first we argue that if

$$\varphi(\sqrt{-L}) = \varphi^b(\sqrt{-L}) + \varphi^\#(\sqrt{-L}), \tag{5.1}$$

then it is enough to prove the result for $\varphi^\#(\sqrt{-L})$. This is because, we have

$$|\varphi^b(\lambda)| \lesssim (1+|\lambda|)^{-m} \text{ for some } m > \frac{n}{2}, \tag{5.2}$$

where $\dim M = n$.
With that in place, as in (1.14), we have

$$\varphi^b(\sqrt{-L}) : L^1(M) \longrightarrow L^2(M). \tag{5.3}$$

This gives, by duality,

$$\varphi^b(\sqrt{-L}) : L^2 \longrightarrow L^\infty. \tag{5.4}$$

Now, we can prove the following inclusion on a compact manifold:

$$\|.\|_{\mathrm{BMO}_L} \lesssim \|.\|_{L^\infty}. \tag{5.5}$$

This is because, for small enough $t > 0$, we have

$$\frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{t}}(y)|}\int_{B_{\sqrt{t}}(y)} |f(x) - e^{tL}f(x)|dx \leq \|f - e^{tL}f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^\infty}.$$

(5.4) and (5.5) give

$$\|\varphi^b(\sqrt{-L})f\|_{\mathrm{BMO}_L} \leq \|\varphi^b(\sqrt{-L})f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2}, \tag{5.6}$$

which means

$$\varphi^b(\sqrt{-L}) : L^2 \longrightarrow \mathrm{BMO}_L. \tag{5.7}$$

(5.5) and (5.7) give

$$\varphi^b(\sqrt{-L}) : L^\infty \longrightarrow \mathrm{BMO}_L. \tag{5.8}$$

Finally, we have

Proposition 5.1.

$$\varphi^\#(\sqrt{-L}) : L^\infty \longrightarrow BMO_L.$$

Proof.

$$\frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{t}}(y)|}\int_{B_{\sqrt{t}}(y)}|\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L})f(x)-e^{tL}\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L})f(x)|dx$$
$$\leq \frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{t}}(y)|}\int_{B_{\sqrt{t}}(y)}|\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L})\psi(x)f(x)-e^{tL}\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L})\psi(x)f(x)|dx$$
$$+\frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{t}}(y)|}\int_{B_{\sqrt{t}}(y)}|\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L})(1-\psi(x))f(x)-e^{tL}\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L})(1-\psi(x))f(x)|dx$$
$$=\Psi_1+\Psi_2.$$

where ψ is a smooth cut-off function supported in $B_{\sqrt{t}+\delta}(y)$, and $\psi(x)\equiv 1$ on $B_{\sqrt{t}}(y)$. Clearly, by Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_1&=\frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{t}}(y)|}\int_{B_{\sqrt{t}}(y)}|\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L})\psi(x)f(x)-e^{tL}\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L})\psi(x)f(x)|dx\\&\leq\frac{1}{\sqrt{|B_{\sqrt{t}}(y)|}}\|\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L})\psi f-e^{tL}\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L})\psi f\|_{L^2}\\&\lesssim\frac{1}{\sqrt{|B_{\sqrt{t}}(y)|}}\|\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L})\psi f\|_{L^2}\text{ (by contractivity of heat semigroup)}\\&\lesssim\frac{1}{\sqrt{|B_{\sqrt{t}}(y)|}}\|\psi f\|_{L^2}\\&\leq\frac{1}{\sqrt{|B_{\sqrt{t}}(y)|}}\|\psi f\|_{L^\infty}\sqrt{|B_{\sqrt{t}+\delta}(y)|}\\&\lesssim\|\psi f\|_{L^\infty}\leq\|f\|_{L^\infty}.\end{aligned}$$

Also

(5.9)
$$|\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L})(I-e^{tL})(1-\psi(x))f(x)|\leq\int_{M\setminus B_{\sqrt{t}}(x)}|(k^{\#}(x,z)-k_t(x,z))(1-\psi(z))f(z)|dz$$

$$\leq\|f\|_{L^\infty}\int_{M\setminus B_{\sqrt{t}}(x)}|k^{\#}(x,z)-k_t(x,z)|dz \tag{5.10}$$

where k_t is the integral kernel of $\varphi^{\#}(\sqrt{-L})e^{tL}$. Now, choosing t small[1], we are done by the Key Lemma 4.4. □

So, let us see the immediate consequence of Proposition 5.1. By virtue of this, we immediately have L^p-continuity of $\varphi(\sqrt{-L})$ upon application of Theorem 5.6 of [DY1]. This L^p-continuity result is not new of course. It is established in a more general context in [DOS]. [T2] has a different proof of this same result. However, we believe that our proof is rather different

[1]This is the main reason for introducing BMO^{ϵ}_{L} instead of just the usual BMO_L

from both of these. Also, it must be remarked that Key Lemma 4.4, in conjunction with Theorem 1 of [DM] also implies directly that $\varphi(\sqrt{-L})$ is of weak type (1,1), which by application of the Marcinkiewicz interpolation techniques, will give another proof of the L^p-continuity (also refer to Lemma B.1 of [T6] for a discussion of Theorem 1 of [DM]).
Note also the $L^\infty - \mathrm{BMO}_L$ result in Theorem 6.2 of [DY1]. However, the conditions used to prove Theorem 6.2 in [DY1] are stronger than (1.17). So, in comparison, it can be said that we prove similar results in a more restricted setting, but with less assumptions on the heat semigroup e^{tL}.
It is also a natural question to ask what happens if we adopt the seemingly more natural definition of BMO spaces, as follows:

$$\|f\|_{\mathrm{BMO}^\epsilon} = \sup_{B\in\mathcal{B}} \frac{1}{|B|}\int_B |f(x) - A_t f(x)|dx, \tag{5.11}$$

where $\mathcal{B}$ contains all balls of radius less than or equal to ϵ, B is a ball of radius $\sqrt{t}$, and A_t is the operator whose integral kernel is given by

$$h(t,x,y) = \frac{1}{|B_{\sqrt{t}}(y)|}\chi_{B_{\sqrt{t}}(y)}(x).$$

On calculation, it can be seen that estimates on

$$\int_{d(x,y)\geq\sqrt{t}, d(y,z)\geq\frac{\sqrt{t}}{2}} |k^\#(x,y) - k^\#(x,z)|dx$$

will imply that

$$\sup_{y\in\overline{M}}\sup_{t\in(0,\varepsilon]}\int_{d(x,y)\geq\sqrt{t}} |k^\#(x,y) - k_t(x,y)|dx \leq C, \tag{5.12}$$

where k_t represents the integral kernel of $\varphi^\#(\sqrt{-L})A_t$. The issue is, here A_t and $\varphi^\#(\sqrt{-L})$ do not necessarily commute.

5.1. **Acknowledgements.** I thank my Ph.D. advisor Michael Taylor for bringing this project to my notice. I also thank Jeremy Marzuola and Perry Harabin for discussions.

References

[BN] H. Brezis and L. Nirenberg, *Degree theory and BMO. II. Compact manifolds with boundaries. With an appendix by the authors and Petru Mironescu*, Selecta Math. (N.S.), **2** (1996), no. 3, 309-368.

[CGT] J. Cheeger, M. Gromov, and M. Taylor, *Finite propagation speed, kernel estimates for functions of the Laplace operator, and the geometry of complete Riemannian manifolds*, J. Diff. Geom., **17** (1982), 15-53.

[CLY] S. Cheng, P. Li and S-T. Yau, *On the upper estimate of the heat kernel of a complete Riemannian manifold*, Amer. Jour. of Math., **103** (1981), no. 5, 1021-1063.

[CS] J. Clerc and E. Stein, *L^p-multipliers for noncompact symmetric spaces*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A., **71** (1974), 3911 - 3912.

[CW] R. Coifman and G. Weiss, *Analyse harmonique non commutative sur certains espaces homogènes*, LNM # 42, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1971.

[DeDSY] D. Deng, X, Duong, A. Sikora, and L. Yan, *Comparison of the classical BMO with the BMO spaces associated with operators and applications*, Rev. Math. Iberoam., **24** (2008), no.1, 267-296.

[DM] X. Duong and A. McIntosh, *Singular integral operators wwith non-smooth kernels on irregular domains*, Rev. Math. Iberoam., **15** (1999), 233-265.

[DY] X. Duong and L. Yan, *Duality of Hardy and BMO spaces associated with operators with heat kernel bounds*, Jour. AMS, **18** (2005), 943-973.

[DY1] X. Duong and L. Yan, *New function spaces of BMO type, the John-Nirenberg inequality, interpolation, and applications*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **LVIII** (2005), 1375-1420.

[DOS] X. Duong, E. Ouhabaz, and A. Sikora, *Plancherel-type estimates and sharp spectral multipliers*, J. Funct. Anal., **196** (2002), 443-485.

[GT] D. Gilbarg and N. Trudinger, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, Classics in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.

[G] P. Greiner, *An asymptotic expansion for the heat equation*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal., **41** (1971), 168-218.

[Gr] A. Grigor'yan, *Heat kernel upper bounds on a complete non-compact manifold*, Rev. Math. Iberoam., **10** (1994), no. 2, 395 - 452.

[Ho] L. Hörmander, *The analysis of linear partial differential operators III,* Classics in Mathematics, Springer, Berlin, 2007.

[JN] F. John and J. Nirenberg, *On functions of bounded mean oscillation*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **14** (1961), 415-426.

[K] T. Kato, *Perturbation theory for linear operators,* Springer Classics in Mathematics, 1996.

[LM] J.L. Lions and E. Magenes, *Non-homogeneous Boundary value problems and applications Volumes I - III*, Springer-Verlag (1973).

[MMV] G. Mauceri, S. Meda, and G. Vallarino, *Estimates for functions of the Laplacian on manifolds with bounded geometry*, Math. Res. Lett., **16** (2009), 861-879.

[M] A. McIntosh, *Operator theory - Spectra and Functional Calculi,* Online lecture notes, 2010.

[Mu] M. Mukherjee, *On certain properties of the Weinstein functional on Riemannian manifolds*, Preprint, 2014.

[RS] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of Mathematical Physics, I. Functional Analysis*, Academic Press, New York, 1972.

[Sc] K. Schmüdgen, *Unbounded self-adjoint operators on Hilbert space*, GTM 265, Springer, Dordrecht, 2012.

[SeS] A. Seeger and C. Sogge, *On the boundedness of functions of pseudodifferential operators on compact manifolds*, Duke Math. Jour., **59** (1989), 709-736.

[See] R. Seeley, *Complex powers of an elliptic operator*, 1967 Singular Integrals (Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Chicago, Ill., 1966), 288-307, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I.

[S] A. Sikora, *Riesz transform, Gaussian bounds and the method of wave equation*, Math. Z., **247** (2004), 643-662.

[Str] R. Strichartz, *Analysis of the Laplacian on the complete Riemannian manifold*, J. Funct. Anal., **52** (1983), 48-79.

[T1] M. Taylor, *Pseudodifferential operators*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1981.

[T2] M. Taylor, *L^p bounds on functions of generalized Laplacians on a compact manifold with boundary*, available at http://www.unc.edu/math/Faculty/met/lpmb.pdf.

[T3] M. Taylor, *Hardy spaces and BMO on manifolds with bounded geometry*, J. Geom. Anal. **19** (2009), No. 1, 137 - 190.

[T4] M. Taylor, *L^p estimates on functions of the Laplace operator*, Duke Math Jour., **58** (1989), 773-793.

[T5] M. Taylor, *Functions of the Laplace operator on manifolds with lower Ricci and injectivity bounds*, Comm. PDE, **34** (2009), 1114- 1126.

[T6] M. Taylor, *Partial differential equations. I. Basic theory*, Applied Mathematical Sciences, 115. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2010.

[X1] X. Xu, *Gradient estimates for the eigenfunctions on compact manifolds with boundary and Hormander multiplier theorem*, Forum. Math., **21** (2009), 455-476.

[X2] X. Xu, *Eigenfunction estimates for Neumann Laplacian and applications to multiplier problems*, Proc. AMS, **139** (2011), 3583-3599.

E-mail address: mayukh@live.unc.edu